



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,299	03/04/2002	Basil Naji	BALDS2.025AUS	6646
20995	7590	12/22/2003	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			MARCANTONI, PAUL D	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				
IRVINE, CA 92614			1755	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/090,299	NAJI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Paul Marcantoni	1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . 6) Other: ____ .

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a and b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Armbrust Jr '485, Gebhardt '985, McOnie et al. '832, or Gehm (abstract from Paper Trade Journal).

Armbrust teaches a composition that is composed of alumina trihydrate that is manufactured in this process. Applicants' dewatering aid reads on merely alumina trihydrate alone and thus anticipates the instant invention. Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, although this reference does not teach the applicants' claimed intended use, the new use of a known composition is not a patentable distinction directed to the composition.

Gebhardt teaches a composition comprising coal fly ash cenospheres thus anticipating the instant invention. Applicants also teach adding to cement and thus this

anticipates applicants' claimed invention. Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. More so, it is noted that *comprising* claim language leaves the claim open for the inclusion of unspecified ingredients even in major amounts. Ex parte Davis et al., 80 USPQ 448 (PTO Bd of App. 1948). It is also noted that while Gebhardt may not teach the same intended use as applicants for their fly ash, the new use of a known composition is not a patentable distinction.

McOnie et al. teach adding fly ash as a dewatering aid thus anticipating the instant invention (see claims). Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Gehm also teaches adding fly ash as a dewatering aid thus anticipating the instant invention (see abstract). Even if not anticipated, overlapping ranges of amounts would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 1 and 2 are also rejected under 35 USC 102 (a and b) over Turunc and Yoon (see claims). Both references teach particulate material for dewatering and because applicants do not claim the identity of their particulate material in broadly recited claim 1, this could read on any particulate material including those of these references thus anticipating the instant invention.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-78 of U.S. Patent No. 6,346,146 B1 (Duselis et al.), claims 1-72 of US Patent No. 6,506,248 B1 (Duselis et al.), and US Patent No. 6,572,697. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all teach a composition containing fly ash and/or silica fume (same as silica flour), or alumina trihydrate which is for a cement formulation in amounts that overlap the instantly claimed invention. Although these patents do not specifically claim a dewatering aid, this is an intended use of a known composition that is already claimed by these patents.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

Art Unit: 1755

Claim 1 is indefinite because applicants do not particularly point out and distinctly claim the identity of the particulate material that is a dewatering aid.

Claim 3 is indefinite because it is not clear how fly ash differs from cenospheres since fly ash itself contains cenospheres.

It is also noted that claim 10 is definite yet it can read upon a single fly ash component of around 10 microns. In other words, if this was the case, and it is possible, the first fly ash component and the second fly ash component would be indistinguishable from one another because they would be the same particle size. Note that the first fly ash component could potentially be about 10 microns and make this situation possible.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Marcantoni whose telephone number is (703)-308-1196. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell can be reached on (703) 308-3823. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-872-9310 for regular communications and (703)-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.



PAUL MARCANTONI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1700